

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Sylvester Wolfe, #197110,)	C/A No. 4:13-2005-JFA-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
)	(partial summary dismissal)
William R. Byars, Jr.;)	
Doctor Thomas E. Bryne, MD, and)	
Warden John M. Pate,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This is a civil action filed *pro se* by a state prison inmate. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1), and District of South Carolina Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such *pro se* cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § § 1915(e); 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

BACKGROUND

Sylvester Wolfe (“ Plaintiff”) alleges medical indifference at Allendale Correctional Institution in connection with a broken arm that he suffered on August 27, 2012. ECF No. 1, Compl. 4. He alleges that he has been in continuing pain since that time and that his elbow is “not in place.” *Id.* Plaintiff asserts that both Dr. Byrne and Warden Pate are aware of his continuing problems, but they refuse to take measures to alleviate his pain. *Id.* He does not allege that Defendant Byars is personally aware of the problems, nor is a policy of indifference alleged. Plaintiff seeks damages from all three named Defendants. *Id.* at 4.

INITIAL REVIEW

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint filed in this case. This review has been conducted pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § § 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *De'Lonta v. Angelone*, 330 F.3d 630, 630n.1 (4th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that this Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990). Even under this less stringent standard, the Complaint filed in this case is subject to partial summary dismissal as to one Defendant under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

DISCUSSION

The Complaint should be partially summarily dismissed as to Defendant Byars, the Director of the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC") because the allegations in the Complaint fail to state a plausible § 1983 claim for medical indifference and/or supervisory liability against him. As a general rule, the doctrine of vicarious liability or *respondeat superior* is not available to

a § 1983 Plaintiff as a means to create liability of a state-actor supervisor for the acts or his/her subordinate. *See Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978). There is a limited exception to the prohibition against imposing *respondeat superior* or vicarious liability on supervisory personnel in § 1983 cases, which has been enunciated in cases such as *Slakan v. Porter*, 737 F.2d 368, 370-75 (4th Cir. 1984). Supervisory officials like SCDC Director Byars may be held liable in certain circumstances for the constitutional injuries inflicted by their subordinates so long as the facts alleged satisfy the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals' established three-part test for supervisory liability under § 1983: "(1) that the supervisor had actual or constructive knowledge that his subordinate was engaged in conduct that posed 'a pervasive and unreasonable risk' of constitutional injury to citizens like the plaintiff; (2) that the supervisor's response to that knowledge was so inadequate as to show 'deliberate indifference to or tacit authorization of the alleged offensive practices,'; and (3) that there was an 'affirmative causal link' between the supervisor's inaction and the particular constitutional injury suffered by the plaintiff." *Shaw v. Stroud*, 13 F.3d 791, 799 (4th Cir. 1994) (citations omitted).

In *Randall v. Prince George's County*, 302 F.3d 188, 206 (4th Cir. 2002), the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals concluded that, "[u]nder the first prong of *Shaw*, the conduct engaged in by the supervisor's subordinates must be 'pervasive,' meaning that the 'conduct is widespread, or at least has been used on several different occasions.'" Furthermore, in establishing "deliberate indifference" under *Shaw's* second prong, a plaintiff "[o]rdinarily . . . cannot satisfy his burden of proof by pointing to a single incident or isolated incidents . . . for a supervisor cannot be expected . . . to guard against the deliberate criminal acts of his properly trained employees when he has no basis upon which to anticipate the misconduct." *Id.* (quoting *Slakan*, 737 F.2d at 373).

The *Slaken* exception is not pleaded in this case because there are no allegations of any personal knowledge (or even subjective knowledge) on Director Byars' part of the problems that Plaintiff alleges he has been having with the staff at Allendale Correctional Institution. Thus, regardless of how pervasive the alleged problems at Allendale might be, Byars cannot be found liable for them simply based on his job as the overall "supervisor" at SCDC if he does not know about them. Moreover, there are no allegations from which any potential responsibility of Byars for an unconstitutional SCDC policy or custom could be established. The absence of allegations establishing a plausible § 1983 claim against Defendant Byars requires that the Complaint be partially summarily dismissed insofar as it seeks to hold him liable for damages.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in this case against Defendant Byars *without prejudice*. See *Denton v. Hernandez*; *Neitzke v. Williams*; *Haines v. Kerner*; *Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-04 (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*; *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d at 74; *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

August 21, 2013
Florence, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).